

**REMARKS**

Claims 4—9 and 13—18 are now pending in the application. No claim amendments have been proposed with this paper. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the final rejection in view of the remarks contained herein.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

With respect to independent claims 4 and 13, applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's position that Bloodworth discloses a method which simultaneously transmits a unique address from the local node, through the connection(s), to all of the remote nodes. The Examiner states that in Bloodworth, the address sent by a calling telephone is transmitted simultaneously to other telephones (such as T101 and T102) with only a negligible speed-of-light delay through the Main Distribution Frame. Applicant avers that this is not how the apparatus of Bloodworth operates.

None of the telephones of Bloodworth are connected directly together by the Main Distribution Frame 44. Instead, each telephone is connected to its own Subscriber Line Interface Circuit (SLIC/TRF). Fig 13 and Col 33, lines 12-30.. Each SLIC/TRF is in turn serviced by a MUX and a DE-MUX circuit at a rate determined by the Conversion Control Circuits. Col. 4, lines 42-46. Such an arrangement by no means provides the applicant's claimed element of simultaneously transmitting a unique address from the local node, through the connection(s), to all of the remote nodes.

Applicant also respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's position that Bloodworth discloses a method which changes the impedance of at least one of the remote nodes in response to the unique address being received at the at least one of the remote nodes. Bloodworth does not disclose such a method, and instead discloses a method by which a person picks up the handset (which changes the impedance) in response to the telephone ringing. The ringing is caused by a 20 Hz, 90 Vpp signal created by a ring signal generator. Col. 11, lines 11-38. Bloodworth's ring signal and ringing sounds are by no means the unique address which was sent by the calling telephone. Therefore, Bloodworth does not disclose a device which changes the impedance of at least one of the remote nodes in response to the unique address being received at the at least one of the remote nodes.

On these grounds applicant respectfully avers that these claims, as well as those depending either directly or indirectly therefrom, are in a condition for allowance and that the examiner reconsider the final rejection.

**CONCLUSION**

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 9/30/04

By: 

Edwin W. Bacon, Jr.  
Reg. No. 39,098  
248-944-6526

DAIMLERCHRYSLER INTELLECTUAL CAPITAL COMPANY  
CIMS 483-02-19  
800 Chrysler Drive  
Auburn Hills, Michigan 48326

Serial No. 10/673,811

7